

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 11, 2000

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHERWOOD).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 11, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DON SHERWOOD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4577. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4577) "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPECTER, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GREGG, Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. KYL, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUE, Mr. REID, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BYRD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 311. An act to authorize the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs, and for other purposes.

### MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the par-

ties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall the debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) for 5 minutes.

### TRIBUTE TO HARRIET RESSLER

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a very special woman. A few weeks ago, Harriet Ressler celebrated her 60th year in business. Sixty years ago, she opened a women's clothing store in Blooming Prairie, Minnesota, named Harriet's Dres-Wel. That was back in 1940.

Mr. Speaker, I might just say that Harriet just celebrated her 86th birthday as well. She started back then with only one employee who came in to cover the lunch hour and got paid 50 cents a day. She now has 10 employees and the business has expanded to two buildings. Up until 2 weeks ago, she worked 6 days a week.

Mr. Speaker, in a world that some say is dominated by glass ceilings, Harriet Ressler is living proof that America is still the land of opportunity.

As Paul Harvey would say, "Harriet, lead on."

### CONGRESS SHOULD ADDRESS THE LIVABILITY OF AMERICAN COMMUNITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we have reached the time in our political calendar when both parties are looking towards their convention as a time to set a tone, to chart a course, and to identify the policies and priorities that a new administration might bring. Both parties are crafting their platforms in an effort to highlight the most appealing parts of their agendas and to attract voters.

At the same time, this Congress is moving towards its final few days, debating and voting on the legislation that will be our legacy. If we want to leave our mark on America's future, now is that time.

As one who came to Congress to help make our communities more livable, to

make them places where families could be safe, healthy, and economically secure, I would urge my colleagues in both parties to take advantage of the opportunity we have to deal with these issues today, to get in step with the concerns and demands of millions of Americans who are concerned about the livability of our communities.

Last week, The Washington Post carried a front-page article detailing the political importance of these issues of livability, sprawl, congestion and green space in California, our Nation's largest State.

After a decade of neglect, Californians are refocusing their attention and their tax dollars on green spaces, cleaner water, preservation of seacoast, mountains and the desert. This spring, State voters approved a \$2.1 billion measure for better parks and conservation.

In Los Angeles, which has only one-tenth of an acre of green space per 1,000 residents, the smallest amount of any major American city, the State is planning on spending \$80 million to create parks and recreational land along the Los Angeles River.

It will also give some of the money from the bond proceeds to private groups to purchase and preserve open space. For instance, in Los Angeles, the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy will get \$35 million to purchase remaining open land around the city.

State action, however, is just the tip of the iceberg. In the past 2 years, almost 20 cities have approved restrictions on sprawl. And although this kind of sentiment might be expected in the traditional more "activist" areas of the State, it is being manifested across California.

Last month's Field Poll showed 70 percent of voters feeling it was very important to elect officials with strong environmental commitment. The Public Policy Institute of California found a majority of voters preferred to spend their State surplus on green space rather than tax cuts.

Even more telling is that a majority of voters in Los Angeles, in the Bay Area, and even in the Central Valley told pollsters they would favor initiatives to slow development, even if it meant slowing economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, as an advocate for livable communities, I do not believe that it is necessary at all to trade economic growth for sensible development policies. Intelligently using our resources and coaxing more value from the investments we make can make such false choices unnecessary.